REMARKS

In the Office Action dated April 1, 2009, claims 1, 2, 5, 7-10, 12, 14-16, and 18-20 were presented for examination. Claims 1, 2, 5, 7-10, 12, 14-16 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101, and claims 19 and 20 were rejected under §112, second paragraph.

I.   Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101

In the Office Action dated April 1, 2009, claims 1, 2, 5, 7-10, 12, 14-16 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 7, and 12 to overcome the above rejection. The amendments are aimed to tie the method steps to hardware elements such as a processor and a memory. More specifically, the processor is in communication with the memory containing information about vertices in a graph. Support for this amendment is found in paragraph 0014 of Applicant's publication. No new matter has been added with this amendment. It is Applicant's position that the processor and memory, as hardware components, are physical and tangible elements and are considered statutory subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner remove the rejection set forth under 35 U.S.C. §101 and grant an allowance of claims 1, 2, 5, 7-10, 12, 14-16 and 18 .

II.   Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

In the Office Action dated April 1, 2009, the Examiner rejected claims 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. More specifically, the Examiner asserts that claims 19 and 20 lack proper antecedent basis and contain confusing language. Applicant has amended claims 19 and 20 to clarify the claimed subject matter. According to the Applicant's invention, each removed vertex with a connectivity count equaling zero and all its neighboring vertices removed in previous iterations form a current eliminated clique. The size of this clique is compared with the size of each previously eliminated clique. Subsequently, the current eliminated clique is stored if its size is greater than the size of any of the previously stored eliminated cliques. In addition, a maximum clique in said graph is determined by comparing the number of completely

interconnected vertices left in the graph with the number of the vertices in each of the stored eliminated clique. Support for the amendment is found in Fig. 2, items 50-56 and paragraph 0016 of Applicant's publication. No new matter has been added with the amendment presented herewith. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner remove the rejection set forth under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and grant an allowance of claim 19 and 20.

III.   Conclusion

In view of the forgoing amendment and remarks to the claims, it is submitted that all of the claims remaining in the application are now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Applicant is not conceding in this application that those claims in their prior forms are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claims are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the application. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuation and/or divisional patent applications. Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application, the undersigned respectfully requests that she be contacted at the number indicated below.

For the reasons outlined above, an allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
By: /Rochelle Lieberman/
        Rochelle Lieberman
        Attorney for Applicant
        Registration No.   39,276

Lieberman & Brandsdorfer, LLC
802 Still Creek Lane
Gaithersburg, MD 20878-3218
Phone: (301) 948-7775
Fax: (301) 948-7774
email: rocky@legalplanner.com
Date: July 1, 2009